(vii) importing from abroad of seed potatoes of the Great Scot variety to the extent possible for distribution to the ryots.

The above relief measures are being actively considered for the issue of expeditious orders.

I have myself taken up the question of importing potato seeds from abroad with the Union Minister for Food and Agriculture, requesting him to look into the matter personally. He has promised to do so.

Let me assure hon. Members that there is no need to take any alarmistic view of the situation and that all possible steps have been and are being taken to give immediate relief to the potato growers in the Nilgiris district.

V. GOVERNMENT BILLS.

(1) THE MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1961 (L.A. BILL NO. 25 OF 1961).

* THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I move—

'That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment Bill, [a] 1961 (L.A. Bill No. 25 of 1961), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration.'

The Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act was enacted in the year 1946, with a view to preventing indiscriminate destruction of private forests (especially those in estates governed by the Madras Estates Land Act) and interference with customary and prescriptive rights therein. The Act, as it stands, now applies to forests situated in estates, as defined in the Madras Estates Land Act, 1908, and to private forests situated in other areas exceeding 30 acres, which may be declared by the State Government to be forests for the purposes of the Act. The Act provides that no owner of any private forest shall, without the previous sanction of the District Collector, sell, mortgage, lease or otherwise alienate the whole or any portion of the forest, and that no owner of any forest and no person claiming under him whether by virtue of a contract, licence, or any other transaction entered into before or after the commencement of the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act, or any other person, shall without the previous permission of the District Collector cut trees or do any act likely to denude the forest or diminish its utility as a forest except the removal of dead or fallen trees or any act done for the usual or customary domestic purposes or for making agricultural implements.

The Act was originally enacted as a temporary measure for a period of two years with effect from 3rd December 1946 and it has since then been continued for one or two years at a time. It was

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 155–216 infra.

28th August 1961] [Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam]

proposed to embody the essential provisions of the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act in the Madras Forests Act, 1882, by amending it. It was, however, later on decided that separate permanent and effective legislation should be undertaken in respect of private forests in this State. As separate legislation regarding private forests did not materialize, when the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act was due to expire last time, the life of the Act was extended up to and inclusive of 2nd December 1961.

The question of undertaking separate legislation regarding private forests is still under the consideration of the Government. It is not likely that this legislation will materialize before 2nd December 1961, the date on which the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act is due to expire. The Government have, therefore, decided to extend the life of the original Act for a further period of two years beyond 2nd December 1961. The Bill accordingly provides for extension of life of the Act up to and inclusive of 2nd December 1963.

I request the House, Sir, to accept the motion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved—

'That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1961 (L.A. Bill No. 25 of 1961) as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration'. 3-40 p.m.

Sri K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, on three former occasions the life of this Act was sought to be extended any on every one of those occasions it was pointed out from this side of the House that there should be some end to this extension and that a legislation on a permanent basis should be put on the Statute-book. The then Hon. Minister also gave an assurance to that effect. Probably this Minister was not in charge of it then. The Hon. Minister in charge of it then gave an assurance on behalf of the Government that it would be done. Of course, they went on examining the Act and after examination, now they say it is not possible to have a permanent measure. I do not know what the reasons are. If the Hon. Minister would tell us the difficulties, we can consider them. But so far as I could see, there can be no inherent legal difficulty in making this a permanent Act. Sufficient time has already been taken, from 1946 to 1961, that is, about 15 years. Still I am not able to understand why it could not be made a permanent Act and placed on the Statute book. There are no reasons given for not doing it. Therefore, we are not able to say anything more than this. After two years I do not know who will be here to answer if this is not made a permanent measure even then. My submission is at least after two years, this should be made a permanent measure. So long as there are private forests, there must be an Act to prevent unnecessary cutting of trees and destroying of forests and we are all agreed that forests are very essential for our country. Therefore, there cannot be any objection

to the principle of the legislation. I do not know what the difficulties are that stand in the way of the Government bringing in a permanent measure for this purpose. Therefore, I would request the Hon. Minister to make this final and place it on the Statute book.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the main idea is that the provisions of this enactment should be incorporated in the main Forests Act. If it was to continue the provisions in this Bill and amend the main Act, it could have been done two years ago. But only two years back we took the decision that we must undertake a comprehensive amendment to the Forest Act itself. It is an old Act. That has been taken up and that is under examination. That is the reason why we are not able to put this legislation on the Statute-book on a permanent basis. Hon. Members, particularly, in this House have always been complaining that we are in a hurry in undertaking legislation, particularly comprehensive legislation. So far as the Forests Act is concerned, it affects so many interests. That has to be thoroughly examined. The comprehensive Bill has got to be examined by the Board of Revenue, the other departments and Ministries and that is how it takes some more time in getting that legislation ready. Therefore, in the meanwhile, we have to come to this House to get approval for extending the life of the existing Act for two more years.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : It has been there for 15 years.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Only two years ago I said a comprehensive Bill would be brought forward. Just now we have taken the decision to undertake a comprehensive amendment to the Forests Act, and that is why we are asking for extension of life for this legislation. I do not think the hon. Member Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar would say that we should bring it in about two or three months or even within a year.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

'That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1961 (L.A. Bill No. 25 of 1961), as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration'.

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move—

'That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1961 (L.A. Bill No. 25 of 1961) as passed by the Assembly, be passed'.

28th August 1961]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

'That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1961 (L.A. Bill No. 25 of 1961) as passed by the Assembly, be passed'.

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

VI. DISCUSSION ON THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE FOR 1961-62.

*SRI M. ETHIRAJALU : சார், இந்த உபமானியக் கோரிக்கையின் மீது இப்போது 67 லட்ச ரூபாய்க்கு இந்த சபையின் அங்கீகாரம் கேட்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. மக்கள் பொருளாதார முன்னேற்றத்தின் அடிப்படையில் இந்தக் கோரிக்கையில் அடங்கிய செலவு செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதை நாம் எல்லோரும் அறிவோம். ரெவின்யூ அக்கவுண்டில் 37 லட்ச ரூபாயும், காப்பிடல் அக்கவுண்டில் 22 லட்ச ரூபாயும், கடன் அட்வான்ஸ் வகையறுக்களில் 8 லட்ச ரூபாயும் ஆக 67 லட்ச ரூபாய் கேட்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்போது சமீபத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட வெள்ள நிவாரண வேலைக்காக தனியாக ஒரு யூனிட்டை அமைத்து வெள்ளத்தினால் பாதிக்கப்பட்ட அணைக்கட்டுகளையும் இன்னும் கால்வாய்களையும் சரிப்படுத்துவதற்காகவே 25 லட்ச ரூபாய் கேட்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இது அதிகமான தொகை என்று நாம் சொல்ல முடியாது. வெள்ளத்தை நேரில் பார்த்தவர்களும் வெள்ளத்தால் ஏற்பட்ட சேதங்களைத் தெரிந்து கொண்டவர்களும் இதைக் குறைந்த தொகை என்றே கருத முடியும். ஆனால் இப்போது ஏற்பட்ட வெள்ளத்தினால் மிகவும் பாதிக்கப்பட்ட இடங்களான திருச்சி, தஞ்சாவூர், கோயம்புத்தூர் இன்னும் தென் ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாக்களில் உள்ள பாதிக்கப்பட்ட அணைக்கட்டுகளையும் மதகுகளையும் சீர்படுத்துவதற்காக ஒரு குறுகிய காலத் திட்டத்தை சீக்கிரம் அமைத்து நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கும்படி நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். ஆனால் வெள்ளம் தாழ்ந்தும் இப்போது ஒவ்வொரு நாளும் "அபாயம், அபாயம்" என்று பத்திரிகையில் வருகிற செய்தியை நாம் பார்க்கிறோம். இதற்கு நாம் முன் எச்சரிக்கையாக இருக்கவேண்டும். இந்த அபாயத்தைத் தடுப்பதற்காக நமது தமிழ்நாட்டு அரசாங்கத்தின் அதிகாரிகளையாவது மைசூர் ராஜ்யத்திலே இருக்க வைத்து, அவ்வப்போது அங்கே பெய்கிற மழையையும் அதனால் என்ன என்ன வெள்ளச் சேதம் ஏற்படலாம் என்பதையும் அடிக்கடி நம்முடைய தமிழ் நாட்டு அரசாங்கத்துக்குத் தெரிவிக்கும்படி செய்து, நாம் முன் கூட்டி, வெள்ளம் வரும் முன்பு, முன் எச்சரிக்கையாக இருக்க வேண்டும் என்ற பெரியோர் வாக்குபடி, நாம் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டியது அவசியத்திலும் அவசியமென தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

அடுத்தபடியாக, டிராக்டர்கள் வாங்குவதற்காக 10 லட்ச ரூபாய் இந்த மானியத்திலே கோரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்போது நம்மிடத்திலே இருக்கிற டிராக்டர்கள் மொத்தம் 138. ஆனால், 3-50 p.m.